

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 14 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 190251-1410	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on <u>March 14, 2006</u> Signature <u>[Signature]</u> Typed or printed name <u>Brooke French</u>		Application Number 09/752,307	Filed 12/29/00
		First Named Inventor Knight	
		Art Unit 2685	Examiner Tran, Pablo N.
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the		<u>[Signature]</u> Signature Charles W. Griggers Typed or printed name	
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.			
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>47,283</u>		<u>(770) 933-9500</u> Telephone number	
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____		<u>3-14-06</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AP, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAR 14 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:)	
Knight)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2685
Serial No.: 09/752,307)	
)	Examiner: Tran, Pablo N.
Filed: December 29, 2000)	
)	Docket No.: 190251-1410
For: Wireless Communications Methods)	
And Systems Using a Remote,)	
Self-Contained Communications Antenna)	
Unit)	

**REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE**

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants submit the following remarks in support of a Request for a Pre-Appeal Brief

Conference.

Serial No.: 09/752,307

Art Unit: 2685

Page 2

REMARKS**I. Rejection of Claims 1-29, 37, and 38**

Claims 1-28, 37, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Priest, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,106) in view of *Council, et al* (National Transportable Telecommunications Capability: Commercial Satellite and Cellular Comm. For Emergency Preparedness, vol. 1, conf. 11, pages 137-140). Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified system of *Priest, et al* in view of *Knoblach, et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,941). Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully submits that the rejection of record is clearly not proper.

Specifically, Applicant submits that the following clear legal deficiency exists in the rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that a claimed element, specifically among others, "transceiving communication signals between said equipment and a disconnected cell site that has been disconnected from its cellular system" is not taught by the references of record either singularly or in combination. The Office Action alleges that "Priest teaches that the deployable BS sample [sic] RF energy emanating from other fixed base stations (col. 5/ln. 10-13)."

Applicant challenges the Examiner's statement as clear error. Applicant respectfully submits that sampling RF energy emanating from other fixed base stations is **not** communicating with a cell site that has been disconnected from its cellular system. Moreover, this statement seems to have been read out of context. The pertinent section reads:

The receiving section 140 includes a low power PA (power amplifier) and additional receiver attenuation incorporated within the section denoted schematically as PAD 142. This allows the deployable base station to sample the RF energy emanating from other base stations (either fixed or mobile). This information, in turn, allows the deployable base station to choose a control channel to communicate with portable stations without interfering with pre-existing nearby base stations (either fixed or mobile)."

Priest, col. 5, lines 8-17.

Serial No.: 09/752,307
Art Unit: 2685
Page 3

The purpose of the sampling is not to communicate with the pre-existing base station (e.g., one that has been disconnected from its cellular system), but to choose a control channel such that it does not interfere or communicate with pre-existing base stations. *Priest* clearly teaches away from the subject matter of the claims. Neither *Council* nor *Knoblauch* makes up for the deficiency in *Priest*. Therefore, since all elements of the claims are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the references of record, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action further takes Official Notice that some features in the claims are well-known in the art. As noted by the court in *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091 (CCPA 1970), the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the examiner must be "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute." If Applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. Applicant submits that the examiner's assertion was adequately traversed. In turn, Examiner submitted three separate patents as documentary evidence that the features are well-known.

Applicant respectfully submits that a singular patent is not sufficient evidence in and of itself to support a conclusion that a feature is well-known. Instead, Applicant submits that the fact that the feature was considered patentable by the U.S.P.T.O is evidence that the feature is not well-known. In fact, if the mere presence of a feature in a patent leads to the conclusion that the feature is well-known, a claim would almost never be found to be allowable. Applicant further asserts that proper patent examining procedure would use the cited references in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 should one be deemed warranted. As the cited features have not been shown capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to deny dispute, the finding that the features are "well-known" is improper and the claims should be allowed.

Serial No.: 09/752,307

Art Unit: 2685

Page 4

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By: 
Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933

Customer Number: 38823